

12.00 hrs.

**CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER
OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE**

**PROPOSED RESUMPTION OF U.S. ARMS
SUPPLIES TO PAKISTAN**

MR. SPEAKER: Calling Attention (Interruptions).

Nothing will go on record....
(Interruptions).

Everyday you are doing it. This is not the time.

Please sit down... (Interruptions) I am not going to allow. There should be some limit to this.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contal): I want an hour before the time, the Minister's statement used to be made available to us. But to-day only one minute before, it has been given to us. (Interruptions).

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra): Mr. Samar Guha has a perfectly valid point, Sir.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Just at 12 noon it has been made available to us. I want that you should give necessary instructions in the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The only alternative is, we should read it now.

SHRI PILOO MODY: The Minister must get up half an hour earlier on the days his Calling Attention comes up for discussion.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore): I call his attention, without even having had the opportunity to look at this statement.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SWARAN SINGH): I will read it.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: That is not the practice. Please observe the practice which is, to give it earlier.

Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:

"The reported statement by Mr. James Sisco of U.S. Department of State about proposed resumption of US arms supplies to Pakistan."

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it was officially announced in Washington yesterday by the State Department that with immediate effect the United States is lifting the embargo on the supply of arms to Pakistan. As a result, Pakistan will immediately receive 300 armoured personnel carriers, reportedly valued at \$13 million, and aircraft engines, military spare parts and parachutes valued at \$1.1 million according to U.S. statement. It is clear from the announcement that the United States Government will permit Pakistan to acquire non-lethal military equipment as well as spare parts for lethal weapons given to Pakistan earlier by the United States.

I had reiterated our grave concern yesterday over the American supply of arms to Pakistan and had expressed the hope that the United States Government would carefully consider the implications of such arms supplies and refrain from this action. The Foreign Secretary also conveyed our strong feelings on the subject to the American Ambassador in New Delhi yesterday, as this would have a negative effect on Indo-American relations and on the process of normalisation on the sub-continent. Our Ambassador in Washington is also taking up the matter immediately with the United States Government to convey our grave concern on their decision.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): Why concern, Sir, why not condemnation? Let us condemn here and now.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Sir, the grave concern which is felt throughout our country cannot just be expressed by me here adequately in a few words. I find, Sir, that even in this statement which has just been read out to us, the same old habit of the External Affairs Minister,—to try to accept everything that is said officially in Washington at its face value and to behave like innocent babies in the face of all past experience,—still continues. Mr. Swaran Singh says:

“It is clear from the announcement that the United States Government will permit Pakistan to acquire non-lethal military equipment as well as spare parts for lethal weapons given to Pakistan earlier by the United States.”

He says it is clear to him, but it is not clear to me I would like to know from him—he used to be Minister of Defence at one time—whether these APCs (Armoured Personnel Carriers) — 300 of them—are going to be supplied immediately at a cost of 13 million dollars. Does this fall within the category of non-lethal equipments? I want to know this from Mr. Swaran Singh. Anyone interested in defence matters knows what for an armoured personnel carrier is used. They are used for transporting the military personnel on the war front and meant for protection of these men. He admits that these armoured personnel carriers are being given. And yet, he says that it is clear from the U.S. announcement that only non-lethal military equipment is being given.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Where have I said that? That is a separate sentence. You must have studied it carefully.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: How can I do it when you have given it five seconds ago?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: All right. Let us not quarrel on that.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I will read it again:

“It is clear from the announcement that the United States Government will permit Pakistan to acquire non-lethal military equipment as well as spare parts for lethal weapons given to Pakistan earlier by the United States”.

Before that, in the earlier sentence, you have said:

“As a result, Pakistan will immediately receive 300 armoured personnel carriers, reportedly valued at \$13 million....”.

So I am not referring now to the spare parts for the earlier equipment; I am referring to these 300 armoured personnel carriers which according to you, it is very clear, are non-lethal equipment I say they are not at all non-lethal equipment; they are very heavily armed personnel carriers. You should not take these things at their face value and contradict yourself in your own statement.

The spares, of course, are being sent to reactivate the old equipment, old equipment which has been lying perhaps idle or inactive in Pakistan for lack of spares. By receiving these spares now, that old equipment also will be reactivated.

Then it is reported that Mr. Charles Bray, spokesman of the US States Department, said yesterday that ‘the US Government wanted to wipe the slate clean of these commitments’. That means, the earlier commitments. He says that the earlier commitments which were made could not be discharged and now the US Government wants to wipe the slate clean of these commitments.

I want to know whether the Government of India has any information or knowledge as to what those commitments were, regarding which they now want to wipe the slate clean. That means all earlier commitments

are now to be fulfilled in their entirety, *in toto*. What were those commitments? Do we have any inkling? Do we know what are covered by those commitments, to what extent lethal weapons are included therein? We know nothing about them.

Then again, Mr. Bray was asked about sales made under the one-time exception rule after the 1965 war. You remember, Sir, after the 1965 war, it came to light that they were continuing to send certain equipment in spite of the embargo which had been declared. At that time, they said that this came under the one-time-exception rule. Now he was asked again yesterday in Washington. can they not be renewed? That is, sales made under the one-time-exception rule. Mr. Bray replied, 'I do not know. It is a larger question'. That means, that here also they are taking an equivocal stand. That means under the shelter of this so-called one-time-exception rule, earlier contracts and earlier commitments can be renewed; at least he has not said that they cannot be renewed.

Regarding transfer of equipment from third countries to Pakistan, all that has been repeated here is what was told several times in the past, that it cannot be transferred without the approval of the US Government, which means that with the approval of the US Government it can be transferred. Here also there is a big question mark. We know that Iran has been given huge military equipment and aid recently. Other countries, Turkey and so on, have also received such equipment. We have no assurance whatever on this point. At some time or other, if the US Government thinks it fit to give its approval, this equipment can be transferred from these third countries to Pakistan.

What I am quarrelling with is that this statement made by Shri Swaran

Singh is, in my opinion, thoroughly complacent. In the facts of past experience, he does not even attempt to reflect the grave concern felt in the country by everybody who has followed developments since 1965.

We have been told that the spokesman—I would again quote from Mr. Charles Bray:—

"The spokesman said that both New Delhi and Islamabad have been informed of the US Government's decision with regard to the policy which was obtaining from April, 1967 until the total embargo was imposed in 1971."

We remember when that embargo was announced—you will remember in this House—how agitated the House was when it came to light that despite the announcement of this embargo certain shiploads of military equipment were detected, which were being loaded at the New York harbour and were actually on the high seas. Even a paper like the *Statesman*, in its editorial of today, has commented on this, saying:

"Again, although the commitments are said to be longstanding, implying that they were made before 1971 embargo, memories of what happened soon after this embargo are not altogether reassuring. When, in June, 1971, it was reported that the Pakistani ship carrying military equipment had left New York, this was described as 'some kind of slippage'; later it was disclosed that several more ships were carrying arms to Pakistan and it is far from clear that all these shipments had been sanctioned before March 25."

After all, we are not talking in a vacuum; we are not pursuing this matter in an abstract way as though we have no experience and we do not know what has been done in the past. Despite all these assurances and all these so-called embargoes, at least

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

there should have been some reflection about that in the hon. Minister's statement. We do not find anything of the kind.

I must bring to your notice also the fact that there is an organisation in the United States, called the General Accounting Office of the US Government. I find from some American journals which are available here in our reading room in Parliament, that this General Accounting Office, which is referred to as the authoritative Congressional watchdog, has discovered, "Washington, 5th February: that the US Air Force delivered over half a million dollars worth of vital military spare-parts to Pakistan following the Pakistani crackdown against its eastern province." Mind you, after March, 1971, when there was supposed to be an embargo that the United States had declared, the General Accounting Office of the USA has found, even after that, that half a million dollars worth of vital military spare-parts were supplied by the US Air Force to Pakistan.

Then again, it is said "Washington, 10th February: Nixon claims that the US had since 1965 delivered only 70 million dollars worth of arms to both India and Pakistan, and that too, non-lethal equipment plus spare-parts." The authoritative Congressional watchdog, namely, the General Accounting Office, "has unearthed the fact that the arms sales and military assistance from the USA to Pakistan alone exceeded 113 million dollars."

This is the whole, sordid picture. The cynicism of the American Government in Washington and President Nixon is nothing new. We have been the victims of this several times. And their aim is quite clear. The aim, firstly, is to retain Pakistan as far as possible as one of their bases, bolster it up again, by giving them military and other support; secondly, to scrut-

tle the bilateral relations which we were trying to build up between India and Pakistan, for the first time, arising out of the Simla agreement; that bilateralism will be completely sabotaged if once again American imperialists start to interfere in these matters; thirdly, strengthen the militarist elements within Pakistan; we know there is an internal struggle going on in Pakistan, which has become very acute now. It is obvious that America wants to strengthen the militarists there, Tikka Khan and company. Lastly, it is to pressurise India once again so that we are forced to divert our resources, which are required for our developmental purposes again more and more for defence and for security by constantly holding out this kind of threat against us. Why does the External Affairs Minister not give some frank assessment of what he considers the Asian, or global, or sub-continental policy of the United States to be? He is silent about this. So, I want to ask him one or two questions

According to press reports the United States Ambassador who was summoned to the Foreign Office had been told of our displeasure and he had also been told that this is a matter which vitally affects the security of India. I want to know specifically whether we have told the Ambassador to convey to his government that we consider this to be an unfriendly act towards India, which has a particular meaning in diplomatic language, or have we simply said "No, this is very bad for our security; please do not do it." Will he and the Government stop trying to appease the American Government, thinking that by talking soft to them and making all sorts of soothing and billing sounds, the Americans will change their policy? Will they learn from experience? I want a categorical reply to this.

Shri Swaran Singh made his famous statement of "identity of common interest between India and America".

Wonderful common interests are being shown now! And this was referred to tauntingly by the *New York Times* as India's love call. If you go on behaving in this way, they will have nothing but utter contempt for us. That is the real trouble.

I want to know why at the Congress Party session held at Bidhannagar, when an otherwise strongly-worded resolution was taken up, about the atrocities committed in Viet Nam, when my young friend, Shri Das Munshi, sought to mention the name of that power—that is what we read in the papers; if the press reports are wrong, he will correct me; in my opinion, he said so quite rightly and honestly—at that time there was refusal to do so. It was said that the whole world knows who is doing it, why is it necessary to write the name here. What is the meaning of this hide-and-seek, I cannot understand.

In today's *Statesman* there is a news item that the Indian Ambassador in Washington is taking up the matter immediately with the United States Government and so on. Of course, he has to take it up. But to me at least it was revolting to read press reports, and see photographs also, of some farewell party, which was being given in Washington to Shri L. K. Jha, and the report said that there was much jocularly and, I do not know, something was flowing at the party which had made everybody jolly. It came in the press report that Mr. Kissinger came, put his arm on Shri Jha's shoulders and said "Look, now I am tilting towards him". Then, next week, we find they are tilting towards Pakistan.

Shri Jha is quite entitled to attend farewell parties; I do not ask him not to. He can behave jocularly, if he wants to. He can embrace Mr. Kissinger, if he wants to. But as our Ambassador in Washington, doing the job for which he is paid, while he was

at this party, had he no inkling whatsoever of the new policy decision which was being hatched, which was declared within a few days? What was the Ambassador doing? Has he warned us in advance? Has he reported to the Government that a new policy change is taking place and something very ominous is going to be announced very soon? Nothing seems to be known until it comes out in the press.

So, I only want to say that no words can be strong enough to condemn this attitude of the Americans. I think that the House would be well, I think it is in the national interest of our country, that people outside should know, that the sovereign Parliament of this country, all parties without exception, unanimously adopt some sort of resolution or a consensus of opinion, condemning this attitude of the Americans. But it will not be done, because I know the Government is not willing to condemn those people who, time and again, have betrayed their word and have gone calculatedly and deliberately against our national interest. The Government is labouring under this delusion that employing sweet words and diplomatic language and appeasing them will suddenly make them change their heart and give up their global diplomacy. It is a fantastic thing. They are living in a dream world of their own. Therefore, I want to know whether they are willing to change their attitude or not. Or, are they going to continue to appease them and receive in return fresh insults, fresh contemptuous attitude on their part? What do you propose to do for the security of the country which is at stake? Naturally, the people of this country will be willing to do anything, will be prepared to make any sacrifices, for the defence and security of this country, as they have always been doing without hesitation. But what is the policy that is being pursued by the Government of India? Every time a crisis is started, why do

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

you tilt towards the United States and try to woo them? And this is what you have got in return.

This is all I have to say. I would like him to corroborate my earlier statement and tell me why in his statement he makes no assessment whatsoever of the American policy approach towards this sub-continent. After the Bangladesh war, after the Simla Agreement, how do they see the American policy operating? Is it reflected in this milk-and-water statement, which simply goes on saying "we are concerned, we are concerned"? I want to know from him answers to these questions. It is very difficult for me to express in words the indignation which I feel.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Sir, the sentiments which Shri Gupta has reflected are broadly the sentiments in the country and in the House. I am convinced of that. I also share the major part of the concern that he has expressed. Since he is also concerned, if I say "we are concerned" there should be no quarrel over that expression. There is no doubt that this action of the United States Government does pose serious problems for our country, problems of security, problems which arise from giving support, material as well as political, to Pakistan when we were hoping that trends in the Indian Sub-continent were taking shape where all disputes and differences would be settled bilaterally and peacefully. There is no doubt that there will be distinct setback to these processes which, we were hoping, will alter the course of events in the Indian sub-continent.

Several specific points have been mentioned by Shri Indrajit Gupta, and I will try to give as much information as I can with regard to the various points that he has raised.

I would like to say without mincing words that armoured personnel carriers are lethal weapons. There is no

doubt about it. That is why I have categorised it separately. I have not said that they are non-lethal. The second sentence relates to what they have mentioned at the present moment to the effect that apart from this lot, their subsequent supplies will not cover lethal equipments. Whether they keep their word or not is a separate issue.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are believing them?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I am not believing or dis-believing anything. It is my duty to inform the House what the position of the United States Government is on this matter. Once we know it, then we can have our own assessment as to whether in future they will keep their word or not. If we keep these two things apart, perhaps it would be easier for us to understand the problem and to understand its full implications.

There is no doubt at all that provision of spares for lethal equipment will definitely recondition the equipment and, therefore, add to the lethal capacity of the armament with Pakistan. There is no doubt about it. When we take of concern and also danger to our security, surely this means that the fire power and the lethal capacity of the arsenal of Pakistan would definitely be increased by direct induction of lethal equipment plus spare parts for lethal equipment which items, at the present moment, are immobilised. So, there is no doubt that this will have a powerful impact upon the military capacity, striking power of Pakistan. It is for this reason that we talk of risk and danger to our security.

At the present moment, however, except for spares for lethal weaponry which they have indicated, they have mentioned that they have no intention to give directly any lethal equipments like tanks or fighter aircrafts or bombers or equipment of that category. Whether they keep

their word, I cannot vouchsafe for the United States Government remaining firm on their word (*Interruption*) Of course, this is the hard experience of the House and the country that they have always prevaricated upon their word, and we have to take note of that fact. If they prevaricate on this again, then, perhaps, there will be greater justification for you to feel strengthened.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA There will be another call-attention notice here, that is all.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH I would not like Mr Indrajit Gupta to feel that raising of these matters on a call-attention notice has no effect on the world or on the international community or even on the United States of America. I think the way we handle this problem, the support that we get from Parliament on these matters is a very potent factor which means that the entire country, on any particular issue is of one mind and that they are party to the concern that is felt on this score (*Interruptions*).

SHRI S M BANERJEE We want a unanimous Resolution from the House condemning this.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH It is true that, from time to time the United States Government have been saying that the equipment that they supply to Iran or Turkey or to several other countries will not be transferred to Pakistan. They also at one time, said that the equipment that US supplied to Pakistan will not be used against India. But we never accepted that position. Even at that time we said that no one can enforce any such commitment on the recipient country. Once arms and tanks are with Pakistan, then any statement that might be made that they would not be used against India is completely illusory, and we have never accepted that position, whatever they may, go on

saving to the world or to their own people. President Ayub Khan at one time did state that no guns had yet been discovered which would fire only in one direction and not in the other. It is quite obvious that if Pakistan gets any equipment or Iran gets any equipment or Turkey gets any equipment, depending on the relationship that might subsist at any moment between Pakistan on the one hand and Iran and Turkey on the other there will be the possibility of transfer of this equipment to Pakistan from time to time, and in the past also, I would like to recall, such transfer has taken place and we have made statements on the floor of the House, particularly the transfer of certain fighter jets from Iran to Pakistan. In our defence planning we have to take into consideration this risk and the likelihood of some equipment being made available to Pakistan through these sources and in all our planning we have to keep in mind this possibility. And that is the basis upon which we have been planning.

Then Sir

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour) No new light, of course.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH I thought there was enough of darkness in the sense that this is an occasion when

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Gwalior) Darkness at noon.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH It is past noon now (*Interruptions*).

He has mentioned several other instances where the seeming embargo or statement with regard to the commitment that nothing will be passed on to Pakistan has been violated.

We also know that there have been occasions when Pakistan has been getting equipment of American origin

[Shri Swaran Singh]

by some method which is not always publicised and this is, therefore, a matter which puts the responsibility on us to keep a careful eye on all this.

On the political aspect, Mr. Indrajit Gupta has summarised the position, if I may say, quite correctly when he said that this action will definitely encourage Pakistan to be more intransigent and this will also come in the way of the implementation of the Simla Agreement and this will also lend greater strength to the military elements in Pakistan, and also this will cast a greater responsibility on us to undertake effective preparations and make adequate arrangements to safeguard our security and our own sovereignty. It is for this reason that it is a threat to our security and it definitely places a greater burden on us. There is no doubt about it.

I would only like to say, may be he can use perhaps much stronger language, more forthright language, but I do not accept that we are adopting in this respect any policy of appeasement. We have always put across our position in this respect in clear terms and in unmistakable terms and we have always expressed our total opposition to the supply of arms by the United States of America, either directly or indirectly, in no unmistakable terms, and it is wrong to suggest that there is any attitude of appeasement in this. We have to face the situation and face the situation with courage and determination and take adequate steps to build our defence potential and continue to do our best to see that Pakistan gets as little as possible from this source or any other course, because Pakistan does not stand in any real need of protection to this nature, because, according to the Simla Agreement we have agreed that no force will ever be used for settlement of any disputes between India and Pakistan.

A mention has been made about our Ambassador. I would like to say that

he has been interpreting our stand, our policy to the United States administration quite strongly and effectively. Ambassadors may succeed or may not succeed always, but, it will be wrong to suggest that he has not been doing the job. He has been putting across our view-point and our total opposition to the resumption of arms supplies to Pakistan....

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I only wanted to know whether he had any prior information or inkling of this development, and did he inform you?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I said in the other House and I will repeat it. For quite some months now, we did have some information that the United States Government is considering seriously to remove this embargo, either partially or fully, and, on all occasions when this matter was breached with our Ambassador or with the members of our diplomatic staff in Washington, on each occasion, all these various points were fully put across to the Americans—the negative effect it will have on the process of relaxation of tension in the Indian sub-continent, the effect it will have on President Bhutto and the fact that it will make him more intransigent—all these aspects were fully put across to the United States Government, and in this particular case, the United States Government cannot ever take up the plea that they were not aware of the strong opposition of India in this respect.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I do not want to take an alarmist view regarding the issue of supply of arms to Pakistan by U.S.A., because I consider that Pakistan alone is no longer in a position to seriously threaten our security, Pakistan may create blood-letting trouble for us but not to the extent of endangering our security. But I am worried for two reasons. The first reason is this. This arms supply by USA to Pakistan will seriously jeopardise the prospect of

durable peace in the Indian sub-continent. Secondly it will also jeopardise the prospect of normalisation of our relations with the U.S.A. Mr. Chester Bowles the erstwhile U.S. Ambassador to India has rightly pointed out as to what will be the effect of USA's arms supply to Pakistan. He said, I quote him:

"USA's arms supply to Pakistan will have disastrous effect on the prospect of peace in the Indian sub-continent."

The hon. Minister just now mentioned about the Simla agreement. From what Pakistan is doing, namely, to equip itself with the military equipments from various sources, USA, China, Iran and some other CENTO powers, it is obvious that Mr. Bhutto has already killed the spirit of the Simla Agreement. That objective that main objective, namely, of durable peace in our Indian sub-continent has been killed. Now, I would say, the United States, by agreeing to supply arms to Pakistan has only nailed the coffin of the Simla Agreement.

After the new policy of USA towards China and Russia, after the *bhai-bhai* policy with comrade Mao Ese-tung and Comrade Brezhnev, after also the Peace Treaty on the issue of Viet-Nam, it appears to us, the USA, is no longer interested in extending the areas of confrontation, conflict and tension, and that USA is interested now in extending the area of peace, understanding and cooperation. That is why the Indian people will be shocked by this action of the USA because this arms supply to Pakistan will not in any way help to lessen the tension between India and Pakistan. On the contrary, it will aggravate the situation of the conflict that was, and is, with Pakistan. Mr. Sisco used a very peculiar phrase in this connection. He has said:

"In deciding over the issue whether USA will resume arms supply to Pakistan or not they have taken into consideration psychological, and historical background of the political developments in the sub-continent."

Strangely, Sir, they have forgotten that if there is any single factor that contributed to the erosion of democratic institution of Pakistan, the growth of political arrogance of Pakistan, as well as the growth of military dictatorship there and also three military confrontations within one decade this one single factor that has contributed to this situation is the arms supply to Pakistan to the extent of two billion dollars by the U.S.A. since 1954.

This was the most important factor which contributed to three armed conflicts with India by Pakistan. Chinese assistance made a marginal effect but it was squarely the arms' contribution of U.S.A. that arrogated Pakistan to have an armed adventure against India thrice in one decade

In U.S.A. Mr. Sisco, has developed a peculiar new theory in justification of arms supply to Pakistan. In 1954 what was the plea of giving arms to Pakistan? Then America was worried about the security of Pakistan against communist threats and it was also assured to India that they would not allow the American arms to be used against India. We know what effect it had. In all the major conflicts with India the American arms were used by Pakistan against India. They have developed now another strange theory. They want to develop the defence capacity of Pakistan because they want to ensure integrity of Pakistan. For that reason they want to develop the deterrent strength of Pakistan. But against whom? Naturally, against India. I repeat this is a strange theory. On the hand one they say that they want to maintain peace in the Indian sub-continent, on other they are adding fuel to the fire.

[Shri Samar Guha]

What I am worried about for another reason is—I should say the arms supply to Pakistan will not endanger the security of India to that extent as it will endanger the integrity and security of Pakistan itself—the arms supply of America to Pakistan will strengthen the hand of Tikka Khan which will lead to erosion of democratic institution in Pakistan and make him arrogant enough to take again, perhaps, some adventure against India.

I want to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that it is not the only way of directly giving arms to Pakistan. Recently Iran has entered into a military understanding with USA for the supply of arms to the extent of 3 billion dollars. Iran has developed a military alliance with Pakistan. Recently after the Indo-Pak War there had been joint military exercise of Pakistan and Iran armed forces and air force also. Therefore, we have reason to doubt that the old American arms of 400 Patton tanks, 35 Sabre jets and 3 billion worth of new arms that were being purchased from USA will be funnelled into Pakistan through Iran. As I have said USA arms supply to Pakistan will seriously endanger the prospect of peace in the sub-continent, I want to know from the government what reaction our government had from the government of USA after the representation was made by our Ambassador in USA and also what effect it had when Mr. Moynihan met our Foreign Secretary in New Delhi.

I also want to know from the hon. Minister whether Government are considering the question of purchasing \$ 91 million worth communication equipment from US or whether they would try to find any alternative source of supply. I also want to know whether Government will categorically enquire of the US Government whether an embargo would be put on the diversion to Pakistan of the arms supply that would be given to Iran,

to ensure that they are no funnelled into Pakistan. Lastly I want to know whether Government have any consultation with the Government of Bangladesh and in-cooperation with that Government to jointly make a protest to the US Government and also take a united stand on the issue of arms supply to Pakistan and also on the issue of a durable peace in the Indian sub-continent.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I must say that although the hon. member said that he does not take a very alarmist view, I do take a more serious view than he does. For once, I do not agree with him when he says that he does not take an alarmist view. Of course, I am glad if he does not take an alarmist view. He should take a more serious view of the situation.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: See my speeches. How do you say I am less serious or less concerned?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I agree with him. He should be glad to know because I do not generally agree with him. I do agree with him that this will come in the way of establishing durable peace in the sub-continent. This will also come in the way of normalisation of relations and strengthening of friendly relations between India and the US. There is no doubt this will cause a setback in that process.

After that, he expressed his views which I have carefully noted, but at the end he put some questions to which I will give very brief replies. He asked me what was the reaction of the US Government when we took it up with them and what was the reaction when we took it up with Ambassador Moynihan. When we had taken it up they had expressed an intention to supply arms; and the reaction is that they have now announced that they are supplying arms, you can well see the reaction of the U.S. Government.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Did they say 'sorry'?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: That will not help, whether they say 'sorry' or 'not sorry'. What is of greater worry to me is that they have decided to supply arms. So more words of being sorry or of friendship do not matter much.

Then he asked me whether we intended to purchase any equipment from the USA. I query to be put at the appropriate would request him to reserve that time to my colleague, the Minister of Defence.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: It has political implications. Mr. Sisco has said side by side with his statement that they are sending non-lethal equipment to Pakistan, that they are also willing to send 91 million dollars worth of communication equipment to India just to parade to the world that what they are doing to Pakistan they are doing to India also.

Therefore, it deserves his answer.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I would request him not to be taken in by this equation, because our concern and our opposition cannot be diluted merely by the statement that the US is prepared to sell a particular type of equipment to India. We do not discuss the question of purchase of equipment on the floor of the House and I would not like to go into this any further.

He has then mentioned that arms are being supplied to Iran in a big way. That matter was raised by Shri Indrajit Gupta also, and I have already said that the possibility of some arms being passed from Iran to Pakistan cannot be excluded, although the United States continues to say that these arms cannot be transferred without their consent. Now, we know that they can be transferred even without consent, and

then who knows that the consent also will not be available; so, it does pose a threat to us, particularly when we know that Iran and Pakistan are members of the CENTO, and therefore, there is that military tie-up between the two countries.

The hon. Member must have noticed that the Bangladesh Government also has reacted very strongly against this. U.S. decision which we welcome, and that is the answer to his query.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: The question was whether some joint effort will be made in consultation with them.

MR SPEAKER: Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munshi.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSHI (Calcutta South): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not like to say much, because already Mr. Indrajit Gupta and Mr. Samar Guha have expressed their opinion, and our Minister of External Affairs, in answering their questions, has expressed his view. Of course, he was repeatedly trying to say that he is expressing the view of the House and the country but I do not know the view of the Government.

It is surprising to note the significant reason for which the United States is resuming the arms supply to Pakistan. Soon after this ceasefire in North Viet Nam and a certain amount of peace in Hanoi, we were looking forward to the development of Bangladesh. Soon after the successful election in Bangladesh from the 9th March, we found on the 12th March that the Assistant Secretary, Mr Sisco, announced the programme or their policy to resume arms supply to Pakistan. As Mr Indrajit Gupta rightly said this supply of arms is part of the previous commitment on which our Foreign Minister could not highlight anything.

[Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munshi]

I would like to repeat one thing. In 1970, they were to supply seven B57 bombers, four MR aircraft and one squadron of fighters—five F1044 and F5—and 300 armoured personnel carriers, worth £150 million, which ultimately the United States reduced as a concession or something to India, to £15.20 only. We were also aware of the fact that in the last war, B57 bombers used to be given by the United States of America excepting these 300 armoured personnel-carriers which are now being supplied.

It is surprising to note that we have been listening for the last two or three months to the point that the Foreign Ministers was making, namely, that our Government, and of course our country, is restoring the relations with the United States of America as if we had done something wrong with the United States of America in the past. Maybe it is restoration for world peace. I have no objection to that. But it is significant to note that we are trying to restore our relations with the United States of America. For that there must be some basis. The basis is the policy. I want to emphasise this point, for the information of the Foreign Minister through you; whether the existing policy of the United States of America expresses that they want friendship with India and this sub-continent, a friendship which will not injure the interests of the sub-continent. If that is so, why are they resuming the arms supply to Pakistan? The United States, whenever they do anything, is not doing it for nothing. It is their policy.

13.00 hrs.

In 1971 when this question of arms supply to Pakistan by USA came up, the then Assistant Secretary for International Affairs, Mr Paul Warkke said before the House Committee of Foreign Affairs:

"Our business is to use the military sales and grant programmes

to implement the policy of the US. We are not in the business of selling arms or providing arms just for the sake of providing arms."

So, it is not that they are simply fulfilling the commitment made in 1970. It means they are going to exhibit the policy of the US. May be the Simla Agreement which was successfully signed without any interference of international powers has annoyed the Nixon Administration. After this Simla Agreement, if the policy of the US is to supply arms to Pakistan in such numbers as to aggravate the situation in the sub-continent, in what context is the Government of India and the Foreign Minister deliberately telling for the last 2 or 3 months and even today that we are normalising relations with the US? Why not the Foreign Minister today on the floor of the House make a categorical statement that our effort to restore relations with US is not successful because of the attitude of the US at this moment about supplying arms to Pakistan, which is detrimental to the sub-continent and which is a hostile act against India?

I felt like conveying my tributes to my Government and the Prime Minister when I read in the papers that forthwith we have condemned the activities of the guerillas who killed the American diplomat in Sudan. It was highlighted in the press that India is taking the correct stand in condemning acts which are not in the interests of humanity. Nobody objects to that. Today why not the Foreign Minister send the same sort of telegram or message to the US Foreign Minister that the Indian Government whole-heartedly condemns the attitude of the Nixon Administration in resuming arms supplies to Pakistan? Without that, if we simply say that we express our grave concern, it does not reflect the sentiment of a large number of people of this country.

Since independence, we have been able to get £1 million worth of weapons from US against £793 million worth of weapons received by Pakistan from U.S. I am not questioning the effect of these weapons. What I am submitting is during the time the Simla treaty was being negotiated certain international forces, particularly in the US and some forces within our nation also opposed the treaty deliberately, because if there is peace in the sub-continent, the interests of American imperialists would be jeopardised. At this moment when we are facing natural calamities and talking of importing food from US, may be this will be an additional handle in the hands of US to say that India does not have the guts to oppose the US at the moment.

If Mr Chester Bowles, former Ambassador, could say in Dacca yesterday that the people of America and the Congress should oppose this attitude of the Nixon Administration why not the Government of India and the Foreign Minister of India send a message to Mr. Bhutto saying that receiving arms supplies from US will create a hostile attitude between India and Pakistan and work against the impact of the Simla treaty, and also send another message to the Nixon Administration saying that the efforts to restore relations between India and US will be totally upset by the attitude of the US in supplying arms to Pakistan?

Our Government should come with a comprehensive statement apart from the statement the minister has made today, which is very casual. Anybody can prepare such a statement, including myself without asking for Mr. Kaul's help. The statement should reflect the sentiments of the people and should project the policy of Government which is against imperialism.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: The first point relates to the nature of commitments which are supposed to be honoured now by supplying a armoured personnel carrier and spare parts

and certain non-lethal equipment. It is a fact that the earlier commitment did cover, besides armoured personnel carrier, other lethal equipment including aircraft, whether the number and categories are exactly what the hon. member indicated is a matter which is not so important. It is a fact that the earlier commitment did cover aircraft of lethal character, fighters, bombers, etc. The US want to convey that out of the earlier commitment, they are honouring the commitment relating to the supply of armoured personnel carrier and not the other lethal weapons. Now, whether they will stick to that position is something for which I cannot vouchsafe, but the present information given by the US Administration is that out of the earlier commitments relating to lethal weapons, only armed personnel carriers are being supplied. About the others, they have given some indication. When they say it is non-lethal, whether they will stick to it is again something for which I cannot vouchsafe. But I agree that the supply of spares which will reactivate and recondition on the lethal equipment again will increase the fire power and the capacity of Pakistani forces. There is no doubt about it.

Then he has asked a question which is very pertinent and relevant: When the US had indicated that they would resume arms supplies to Pakistan, how can we continue to say that there is a chance or possibility of improvement of relations? It is a very valid question, and it is my duty to clarify the position. Even when I said that we are desirous of improving relations, that was a ministerial statement made in Parliament in this House or in the other House, and even at that time, I did say that any supply of arms by the US Government to Pakistan will come in the way of establishment of normal relations between India and the US. Till they actually decide to supply, it should be the effort of the Foreign Office of our country to see if they can avoid it. But we did not leave them in any

[Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munshi]

doubt that resumption of arms supply to Pakistan will definitely be a factor which will come in the way of restoration of normal and friendly relations between India and US.

His analysis that this action will definitely retard the process of normalisation of relations, I accept; that is what I have stated in the statement and in answer to several supplementary questions.

He wants me to use much stronger language in the opening statement and also in what we should tell the United States of America. I would like to say very clearly and categorically that, while talking to the Americans, we have not minced words. We have told them quite categorically, quite clearly. Still there are ways of dealing with this problem, and we should not always be carried by strong words. Our attitude in this respect is very clear and very fully known to the United States Government, and the expressions that we have used are forthright, are clear—the public statements as well as in the course of our talks and discussions with the United States Government.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: The U.S. Ambassador is meeting the Prime Minister today at 4.30 p.m. Will she also explain the position?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: I am sure that the Prime Minister will certainly convey the feelings in this respect in the country and her own feelings in this respect. There is no doubt about it.

He has made certain suggestions as to what should be the type of our reply or what should be the type of our communication that we address either to Mr. Bhutto or to the United States Government. I have noted his views, and I would like to assure him that we will do our duty. He has stated that I have said from time to time that these are the views of the House.

I would like to say, as a democratic party, the views of the House, in fact, are supreme, and our views are precisely the same. We are part of the House. When I said 'views of the House', in fact, I wanted to raise it to a level higher than just governmental level. Of course, we are part of the House, in fact, majority of the House, and for any one to have the slightest impression that we are not in tune with the House is, to say the least, being unfair to us.

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi): On the 15th January, in the Farewell to Arms Party, Field Marshal Manekshaw, stated that 'the tremendous arms build-up poses a grave threat to India's security'—that is, regarding Pakistan. Lt. Gen. Candeth, who was in charge of the Western Command, stated, 'Pakistan needs six months more to come back to the attack capability' American is not the only arsenal which sells arms to various countries. We concede that each country is free to buy arms from any source. For example, some time back, Pakistan got tanks from Russian sources and at the same time Sabre jets and Patten tanks from USA.

Similarly, Turkey got two million dollars worth of arms aid from the United States of America and anti-aircraft guns and armoured personnel carriers, etc from the Russian in exchange for natural gas. So, I do not question that. In the present context of the lifting of the 1971 embargo by USA and the resumption of supply of lethal military weapons to Pakistan not to call it an unfriendly act and not to condemn this American act in unequivocal terms will be a dereliction of duty on our part.

The embargo implied that till there has been an overall settlement in the sub-continent and till there is stability in the sub-continent, this embargo will continue. But when it is viewed with the movement of Pakistani ships with American arms in 1971 and the movement of the Seventy

Fleet into the Indian Ocean, when all this is considered in that perspective, specially, the statement of Mr. Sisco—the continuance of the military imbalance between India and Pakistan because of India's arms-making capability—I request you to kindly note these terms 'military imbalance', 'balance of power', etc which have often been repeated by the super-powers, this House should take note of it and we should warn them not to poke their nose any more in our affairs and get their fingers burnt.

Much has been said about the Simla Agreement which created a new awareness, a new understanding between two neighbouring countries, and we thought that there will be a cut in the military expenditure and that would be utilised in economic reconstruction. But such actions of the big powers rather act as a spanner in the wheel of any economic progress of these two countries. It leads to a perpetual tension which automatically leads to more expenditure in their national defence budgets.

When I speak of America, it is not Nixon's America; I speak of the other side of America, which is Kennedy's America, which is Martin Luther King's America. Is it not the duty on our part, in a democratic country where public opinion ultimately counts, where there is a possibility of change of government, where under the pressure of public opinion, Mr. Nixon had to run down to Peking and reverse his policy on Vietnam, is it not our duty to educate the public opinion in the United States? Is it not a deficiency on the part of our diplomacy that we have failed in that regard? (Interruptions). I condemn Mr. Nixon all right, but..

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD (Bhagalpur): On this occasion say that much at least,

SHRI P. K. DEO: But, at the same time, I accuse the Government as to

why they did not take steps to educate American public opinion.

My second question is: when democracy has come back in Pakistan, why not cultivate Pakistan and make Mr. Bhutto aware of the danger of the military clique taking over democracy?

My third question is: whether this embargo has been lifted so far as India is concerned and whether weapons, lethal and non-lethal, including communications and radar equipment are being made available to India.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: What was his last question?

SHRI P. K. DEO: As the embargo has been lifted so far as India is concerned, is India receiving any lethal and non-lethal weapons so far as communications are concerned and radar etc. are concerned?

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD: We don't want that.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN (Wandiwash): Let the Minister answer.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Sir, if I may say so, there was some advancement on the original—I would not use the word conservative—policy that had been followed by the party to which the hon. Member belongs. (Interruptions) I said some advancement. But again, he had a tendency sometimes to slip back, may be, he is torn between certain considerations. So, I have every sympathy for him, in the difficulty that he faces. I would not like to comment on the first part of his statement. I will start with the queries which he has put. He also said, there is President Nixon's United States, there is Mr Kennedy's and Martin Luther King's United States. And, he says, it should be our duty to educate U.S. public opinion. I would like to say that I accept that it is our duty to educate public opinion and perhaps it is that effort which gave a lot of

[Shri Swaran Singh]

material to Mr. Kennedy and others who were wanting to understand the problem and this enabled them to put across the view point that India has in this respect.

The second point which he raised was that we should try to explain to President Bhutto that by taking military help this will strengthen the hands of Tikka Khan. I am sure that perhaps a more profitable line will be if he can persuade his leader Mr. Piloo Mody to convey this to President Bhutto. I am saying it seriously. This will have a greater effect on him because Mr. Piloo Mody is a personal friend of President Bhutto. Sir, my saying to him may be taken amiss. My saying to President Bhutto that this will harm him will invoke the reply from him that he knows what is best for him. But, if it is done by Mr. Piloo Mody in his own way, perhaps it may have some effect. I agree with his analysis that these moves are likely to strengthen the militaristic elements in Pakistan. But I am not sure whether conveying this to President Bhutto will have any effect. So, if Mr. Piloo Mody could do this work on behalf of...

MR. SPEAKER: They can go together.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: About the last question, I have already answered this, that arms purchase by India has nothing to do with the present situation that they face, which is a new situation, and the United States spokesman tried to soften the impact that this will have on the public opinion in India and in other parts of the world. We must not forget that this attempt to equate the two countries is completely off the mark. Bulk of Pakistan's armaments are of U.S. origin and if supplies are made—whether they are spares or new lethal weapons and number of other things—this will greatly add to the military potential of Pakistan. And, so far as any equipment which is purely electronic equipment or things

of that type are concerned, this is something which can be obtained, because we were not getting anything free, we have to pay, we can purchase from there or any other part of the world. But the type of attitude which is displayed by the hon. Member means that he is succumbing to the tactics adopted by the United States spokesman in order to give an impression as if they are trying to 'treat the two countries equally. This is not a fact, because in view of the type of equipment supplied in the past by U.S.A. to Pakistan the two situations can never be equated and this is the point which should be kept in mind.

SHRI P. M. MEHTA (Bhavnagar): According to the experts Pakistan has more than made up the 1971 losses by purchasing arms from open market and China has equipped Pakistan with arms and ammunition. Keeping this in view, I would like to know how does the government propose to re-dress the military balance which will be disturbed as a result of the resumption of arms supply to Pakistan by U.S.A.

Their spokesman, Mr. Charles Bray, while announcing the decision said that the U.S.A. had no intention of entering into an arms race in South Asia. Pakistan and India have been inter-med of the U.S. decision. In their judgement this decision cannot be constructed to have a significant effect on the ratio of military power between India and Pakistan. I wish that the Minister may throw further light on these aspects of the version of the spokesman.

Had the Government of India any linking of the mind of U.S.A. government in this respect earlier? If they had taken up the issue through diplomatic channels what did U.S.A. government said about it? Why did U.S.A. not accept India's plea that it would disturb the peace of the sub-continent? Has the government brought this to the notice of some other countries of the world? If not, whether they proposed to do it now. Lastly, whether Government consider that the resumption of arms supply to

Pakistan amounts to definite effort by a third party to upset the Simla Agreement?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Sir, a mention has been made by the hon. Member about the military balance. If I may say, we should deal with this concept of military balance knowing the implications of what we say. We have never accepted this principle of military balance between India and Pakistan. The requirement of India may say so, was some advancement on for a variety of reasons—size of the country and our obligations and then anybody having a look at our neighbours north and west—there is no question of balance—and we should never accept the validity of this doctrine because when you say that the balance has been upset impliedly and implicitly you accept the validity of that doctrine. So, my reply to this is that we do not accept this balance concept. Our requirements are different and any attempt to give an impression that the so-called military balance is not upset is on the face of it unacceptable to us on merits and also on account of our non-acceptance of this doctrine of so-called balance of power.

Then he asked if the U.S. Government had mentioned it earlier and we had taken up this matter with them, what did they say, and why did they not accept our viewpoint. I wish I could answer on behalf of the U.S. Government. How can I say as to why they do not accept what appears to us to be something which they should accept? I cannot find any rational explanation for the U.S. Government not accepting the validity of our attitude in this respect.

Then he asked whether we had mentioned it to other countries, and if not, whether we intended to mention it now. I do not think this will serve any purpose in mentioning this matter to other countries.

3834 LS—7

I think this answers all the questions.

SHRI P. M. MEHTA: What about Mr. Bray's version?

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: Of what?

SHRI P. M. MEHTA: I will read out again.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: That related to balance of power. What he intends to imply is that the reasoning given by Mr. Bray is not correct. I am not saying that he has given valid reasons for their attitude.

MR. SPEAKER: The same thing was quoted by Shri Indrajit Gupta.

SHRI P. M. MEHTA: No, this was not quoted by him. I will quote it again. The Minister mentioned something; I only wish he would throw more light on it. It is a very vital issue.

"The spokesman, Mr. Charles Bray, while announcing the decision said that the U.S.A. had no intention of entering into an arms race in South Asia. Pakistan and India had been informed of the U.S. decision."

When was this decision informed to the Government?

"In their judgment this decision cannot be construed to have a significant impact on the ratio of military power between India and Pakistan."

It is no use saying that we should not give any weightage to this concept.

SHRI SWARAN SINGH: If the object of the hon. member is to point out inconsistencies in or the spurious nature of the buttressing done by

Mr. Bray, I agree with him. But I cannot throw any light as to why he made that statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Papers to be laid on the Table.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): I will take half a minute. A very serious thing about violation of Central Government notification....

MR. SPEAKER: No, not every day. May I make it very clear that these matters can be raised through questions, through motions and other means? I receive so many call attention notices. Now you have started a new practice of sending notices under rule 377. So many of them come. I am not going to allow it. I have allowed only those of Shri Indrajit Gupta and Shri P. R. Das Munsri, nothing else.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I may tell Shri Bosu that I have not allowed anything else

13.35 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

NAVY (PENSION) FIRST AMDT. REGULATIONS UNDER NAVY ACT, 1957

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI J. B. PATNAIK): On behalf of the Minister of Defence, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Navy (Pension) First Amendment Regulations, 1973 (Hindi and English versions) published in Notification No. S.R.O. 56 in Gazette of India dated the 3rd March, 1973, under section 185 of the Navy Act, 1957. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-45/02/73.]

IRON ORE MINES LABOUR WELFARE CESS (AMDT.) RULES UNDER IRON ORE MINES LABOUR WELFARE CESS ACT, 1961

THE MINISTER OF LABOUR AND REHABILITATION (SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Iron Ore Mines Labour Welfare Cess (Amendment) Rules, 1973 (Hindi and English versions) published in Notification No. G.S.R. 82 in Gazette of India dated the 27th January, 1973 under subsection (4) of section 8 of the Iron Ore Mines Labour Welfare Cess Act, 1961. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-4503/73.]

ANNUAL REPORT OF MAHARASHTRA AGRO-INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION FOR 1970-71 UNDER COMPANIES ACT, 1956.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI ANNASAHEB P. SHINDE): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Annual Report (Hindi and English versions) of the Maharashtra Agro-Industries Development Corporation Limited, Bombay, for the year 1970-71 along with the Audited Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon, under subsection (1) of section 619A of the Companies Act, 1956. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-4504/73.]

NAVAL CEREMONIAL CONDITIONS OF SERVICE AND MISC. (AMDT.) REGULATIONS UNDER NAVY ACT, 1957.

SHRI J. B. PATNAIK: I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Naval Ceremonial Conditions of Service and Miscellaneous (Amendment) Regulations, 1973 (Hindi and English versions) published in Notification No. S.R.O. 85 in Gazette of India dated the 3rd March, 1973, under section 185 of the Navy Act, 1957. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-4505/73.]